

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CORDIS CORPORATION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 97-550-SLR
)	(Consolidated)
)	
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
-----)	
)	
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 97-700-SLR
)	
v.)	
)	
CORDIS CORPORATION; JOHNSON &)	
JOHNSON; and EXPANDABLE GRAFTS)	
PARTNERSHIP,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
-----)	

MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

I. INFRINGEMENT

a. Do you find that Cordis has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Medtronic AVE's MicroStent II literally infringes the following limitation of claims 23, 51 and 54 of the '762 patent and claims 1 and 3 of the '984 patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Cordis. A "NO" answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE.)

Limitation	Is This Limitation Present Literally In Medtronic AVE's MicroStent II?
Wall of a tubular member having a substantially uniform thickness	YES ____ NO ____

b. Do you find that Cordis has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Medtronic AVE's GFX stent literally infringes the following limitation of claims 23, 51 and 54 of the '762 patent and claims 1 and 3 of the '984 patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Cordis. A "NO" answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE.)

Limitation	Is This Limitation Present Literally In Medtronic AVE's GFX Stent?
Wall of a tubular member having a substantially uniform thickness	YES ____ NO ____

c. Do you find that Cordis has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Medtronic AVE's GFX 2 stent literally infringes the following limitation of claims 23, 51 and 54 of the '762 patent and claims 1 and 3 of the '984 patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Cordis. A "NO" answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE.)

Limitation	Is This Limitation Present Literally In Medtronic AVE's GFX 2 Stent?
Wall of a tubular member having a substantially uniform thickness	YES ____ NO ____

II. INVALIDITY

Do you find that Medtronic AVE has shown by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid due to obviousness? (A “YES” answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE. A “NO” answer is a finding for Cordis.)

Claim 23 of the ‘762 patent YES _____ NO _____

Claim 51 of the ‘762 patent YES _____ NO _____

Claim 54 of the ‘762 patent YES _____ NO _____

Claim 1 of the ‘984 patent YES _____ NO _____

Claim 3 of the ‘984 patent YES _____ NO _____

You must sign this Verdict Form.

Dated: March ___, 2005

FOREPERSON

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL

/s/ Leslie A. Polizoti

Karen Jacobs Loudon (#2881)
Leslie A. Polizoti (#4299)
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
Attorneys for Medtronic Vascular, Inc.

OF COUNSEL:

Raphael V. Lupo

Donna M. Tanguay

Mark G. Davis

D. Michael Underhill

Michael W. Connelly

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

600 13th Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 756-8000

March 10, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 10, 2005, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing to the following: Steven J. Balick, Josy W. Ingersoll, Karen E. Keller, and Karen Jacobs Loudon.

I also certify that on March 10, 2005, I caused to be served true and correct copies of the foregoing document on the following in the manner indicated below:

BY HAND

Steven J. Balick
ASHBY & GEDDES
222 Delaware Ave., 17th Flr.
P.O. Box 1150
Wilmington, DE 19899

Josy W. Ingersoll
YOUNG, CONAWAY, STARGATT & TAYLOR LLP
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
P.O. Box 391
Wilmington, DE 19899

Gregory Diskant
Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Taylor, LLP
c/o The Hotel DuPont
11th & Market Streets
Greenville Suite, Mezzanine Level
Wilmington, DE 19801

/s/ Leslie A. Polizoti (#4299)
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT AND TUNNELL
(302) 658-9200
lpolizoti@mnat.com